


and second volume and the applicant agreed. The applicant stated that the novelty lays with the universal directory structure which the Examiner showed was not claimed."

However, the Applicant **did not** agree with the Examiner that the cited art teaches "a Volume ID and a first and second volume." To the contrary, the Applicant agreed that the cited art teaches a file having a volume ID corresponding to a single volume that the file is stored within. In addition, the Applicant directed the Examiner to a location in the Christiansen reference (e.g., col. 12, lines 11-22) that the Applicant believed contains description which teaches away from the Applicant's invention. Further, the Applicant **did not** state "that the novelty lays with the universal directory structure." The Applicant used the term "universal type directory structure" as an analogy when referring to what the Applicant regarded as novel.

In conclusion, the Applicant stated that the cited references do not teach or suggest that a single directory structure could point to more than one volume. Indeed, this conclusion is consistent with the Applicant's previous comments in its response to the Office Action submitted February 18, 2003 (see page 3, paragraphs 2-5).

Respectfully submitted,

  
Stephen J. Curran  
Reg. No. 50,664  
AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 6/25/2003